A.   REMARKS

No amendments to the application have been made in this reply. Hence, Claims 1-76 are pending in this application. Acceptance of the formal drawings submitted with the last reply is noted. All issues raised in the Final Office Action mailed September 17, 2004 are addressed hereinafter.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-12, 14-39, 41-56 AND 58-76 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Final Office Action, Claims 1-12, 14-39, 41-56 and 58-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Blumberg et al.,* U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0140315 A1 (hereinafter *"Blumberg"*). It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-12, 14-39, 41-56 and 58-76 are patentable over *Blumberg* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites a method for previewing an electronic document that requires:

"generating the electronic document at a client;
transmitting document information associated with the electronic document from
        the client to a printing device;
generating preview document data at the printing device based on the document
        information and a set of one or more specific characteristics associated
        with the printing device, wherein the set of one or more specific
        characteristics are unavailable at the client;
transmitting the preview document data to the client from the printing device; and
previewing the electronic document at the client based on the preview document
        data received from the printing device."

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Blumberg*. For example, Claim 1 requires "generating

preview document data at the printing device based on the document information and a set of one or more specific characteristics associated with the printing device, wherein the set of one or more specific characteristics are unavailable at the client." The Final Office Action asserts that this limitation is taught by the on-demand printer server 210 of *Blumberg* on the basis that the present application provides an example of a printing device as "a multifunctional peripheral that includes...a server process" and that the Virtual Builder is part of a printing device and that the preview document is generated at a printing device" (Final Office Action, Pg. 20).

Applicant respectfully submits that the starting point for interpreting the claims is the plain language of the claims themselves. Claim 1 clearly recites "generating preview document data *at the printing device* based on the document information and a set of one or more specific characteristics associated with the printing device, wherein the set of one or more specific characteristics are unavailable at the client" (emphasis added). Claim 1 is clear and unambiguous that the generating of the preview document data must be performed at the printing device. The plain language meaning of a printing device is a device with printing capabilities. This meaning is fully supported by the present application. To wit, "[i]n this example, printing device 102 is a multifunctional printer or a multifunctional peripheral (MFP) that includes a scan process 108, a print process 110, a raster image processor (RIP) 112 and a server process 114" (present application at page 8, lines 5-8). Thus, in the example described in the present application, printing device 102 is either a multifunctional printer, i.e., a device having printing capabilities, or an MFP that includes at least print process. Note that in the example of printing device 102 being an MFP, the MFP includes "a scan process 108, a print process 110, a raster image

processor (RIP) 112 *and* a server process 114" (emphasis added). Thus, both examples of printing device 102, like Claim 1, require printing capability. An MFP having a server process without some printing capability is different that the example of printing device 102 in the specification and the requirements of Claim 1.

Turning now to *Blumberg*, there is no description or suggestion that the on-demand printing server 210 includes any printing capability. *Blumberg* describes that "[o]n-demand print server 210 enables a corporate user 230 to order and re-order printing of corporate documents, through a web interface" (*Blumberg*, Section [0142]). *Blumberg* also describes that "[d]ocuments produced by document authoring tool 240 are preferably uploaded to on-demand print server 210, which stores the documents using an electronic document management system 250" (*Blumberg*, Section [0143]). *Blumberg* further describes that "[o]n-demand print server 210 accepts job orders from corporate users such as corporate user 230. Each job order accepted enters an order queue and is managed and processed by an order manager 270 with a web interface. Order manager 270 prioritizes jobs in the order queue, and routes them to available printers at a corporate reproduction center 280. Preferably, difficult orders are routed to an on-line on-demand print facility, such as that described in reference to FIG. 3 hereinbelow" *Blumberg*, Section [0147]. *Blumberg* also describes that "[o]n-demand print server 210 also interfaces with a web server 290, so that corporate clients who are not situated within the corporate intranet, such as the client described with reference to FIG. 4 hereinbelow, may also order copies of corporate documents through their web browsers" (*Blumberg*, Section [0148]). *Blumberg* further describes "[c]lient 400 may access corporate documents on the on-

demand print server 210 (FIG. 2), select finishing options and order copies" (*Blumberg*, Section [0154]).

Thus, on-demand print server 210 is described in *Blumberg* in the context of a classic conventional server for managing documents, without any printing capabilities. All printing is described in *Blumberg* as being handled by other entities, such as local printer 260, or printers available at corporate reproduction center 280. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the on-demand printer server 210 is not any way equivalent to the printing device recited in Claim 1 and that the Claim 1 limitation of "generating preview document data *at the printing device* based on the document information and a set of one or more specific characteristics associated with the printing device, wherein the set of one or more specific characteristics are unavailable at the client" is not in any way taught or suggested by *Blumberg*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 includes at least one limitation that is not taught or suggested by *Blumberg* and is therefore patentable over *Blumberg*.